

UNITED STATES PARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. R 515-4167 GIORGI 07/12/00 09/355,210 **EXAMINER** Г HM12/0213 LUKTON.D JAMES V COSTIGAN PAPER NUMBER **ART UNIT** HEDMAN GIBSON & COSTIGAN 1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS 1653 NEW YORK NY 10036-2601 **DATE MAILED:** 02/13/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/355,210

Giorgi

Examiner

David Lukton

Group Art Unit 1653



🖄 Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 2, 2000	
☐ This action is FINAL .	
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quay/1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of till 37 CFR 1.136(a).	within the period for response will cause the
Disposition of Claim	
X Claim(s) <u>1-14</u>	is/are pending in the applicat
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration
Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
☐ Claim(s)	is/are rejected.
☐ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
X Claims <u>1-14</u>	are subject to restriction or election requirement.
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review The drawing(s) filed on	to by the Examiner is approveddisapproved. 5 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). brity documents have been tional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	

Serial No. 09/355,210 Art Unit 1653

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. §121:

- I. Claims 1-3, 5-9, drawn to compounds.
- II. Claim 4, drawn to a method of making the compounds of Group I.
- III. Claims 10-14 drawn to a method of using the compounds of Group I.

The claimed inventions are distinct.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). Nevertheless, in the event that Group I is elected, and claims therein found allowable, the corresponding method-of-use claims will be rejoined for further examination [*In re Ochiai* (37 USPQ2d 1127)]. Similarly, in the event that Group I is elected, and claims therein found allowable, claim 4 will be rejoined therewith.

Applicant is advised that for the response to this requirement to be complete, an election of the invention to be examined must be indicated, even if the requirement is traversed (37 C.F.R. 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

Serial No. 09/355,210 Art Unit 1653

In addition to the foregoing, applicants are required under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect a disclosed specie for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. A "specie" is a specific compound, with all substituent variables accounted for.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a generic claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are witten in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentable distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lukton. Phone: (703) 308-3213.

An inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

DAVIO LUXTON PATENT EXAMINER GROUP 1800